REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 16-21, 25, 34, 36, and 42 are amended, and claims 5, 8-10, 12, 22-24, 27, 29-31, 33, 35, 40, 41, 43, and 44 are canceled herein. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11, 13-21, 25, 26, 32, 34, 36, 37, 39, and 42 are currently pending in the case. Further examination and reconsideration of the presently claimed application are respectfully requested.

Section 101 Rejections

Claims 16-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response thereto, claims 16-21 are amended in a manner believed to obviate this rejection. Moreover, claims 22-24 are canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this rejection.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10, 13, 14, 16, 20, 25, 26, 29-36, and 39-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,209,007 to Kelley et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Kelley"). Claims 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0143821 to Jakubowski (hereinafter referred to as "Jakubowski"). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987), MPEP 2131. Neither Kelley nor Jakubowski disclose all limitations of the pending claims as set forth in more detail below.

Neither Kelley nor Jakubowski relates to software development kits or teach the processes described and claimed in the present application. For example, claim 1 call for "adaptively navigating" through websites. Examples of such adaptive navigation are given in the present specification, e.g., at page 13. Kelley does not teach this "adaptive navigation."

Further, Kelley does not teach "extracting scripted content" where the scripted content is "loaded and executed" as more fully described in the present specification, e.g., at page 23 and Figure 3. As described, this "extract content" allows access to content that is only visible when scripts are loaded and executed by a client. In contrast, Kelley is cited at Figure 5 as "extracting Javascript code" at 340. As can be seen from Figure 3 and colum 6 of Kelley, Kelley is really just associating hyperlinks in the page as levels. Reading Kelley at column 4, lines 1-9, and column 6, lines 1-8, the Javascript is placed in the HTML to build an output screen. Kelley at column 7, lines 16-25, the javascript is used to generate the output screen. This is in marked contrast to the present invention as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 16, 21, 25, and 36, as well as all pending claims dependent therefrom, are not anticipated by either Kelley or Jakubowski. Therefore, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Section 103 Rejections

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0143567 to Gross et al. (hereinafter "Gross"). As discussed above, it is respectfully asserted that dependent claim 4 is patentably distinct over Kelley or the combination of Kelley and Gross for at least the same reasons as its base claim.

Claims 8, 9, 11, 15, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,047,318 to Svedloff (hereinafter "Svedloff"). Claims 8 and 9 are canceled rendering rejection thereto moot. As discussed above, it is respectfully asserted that depending claims 11, 15, and 19 are patentably distinct over Kelley or the combination of Kelley and Svedloff for at least the same reasons as their respective base claim.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,976,216 to Peskin et al. (hereinafter "Peskin"). Claim 12 is canceled rendering rejection thereto moot.

Claims 17, 43, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly in view of "Effective Web Ddata extraction with standard XML technologies" by Myllymaki (hereinafter "Myllymaki"). Claims 43 and 44 are canceled rendering rejection thereto moot. As discussed above, it is respectfully asserted that dependent claim 17 is patentably distinct over Kelley or the combination of Kelley and Myllymaki for at least the same reasons as its base claim.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,217 to Lewak (hereinafter "Lewak"). As discussed above, it is respectfully asserted that dependent claim 18 is patentably distinct over Kelley or the combination of Kelley and Lewak for at least the same reasons as its base claim.

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,857,124 to Doyle. Claim 27 is canceled rendering rejection thereto moot.

Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley in view of Jakubowski. As discussed above, it is respectfully asserted that dependent claim 37 is patentably distinct over Kelley or the combination of Kelley and Jakubowski for at least the same reasons as its base claim.

CONCLUSION

This response constitutes a complete response to all of the issues raised in the Office Action mailed July 31, 2007. In view of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicants assert that pending claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11, 13-21, 25, 26, 32, 34, 36, 37, 39, and 42 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, comments, or suggestions, the undersigned earnestly requests a telephone conference.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to deposit account no. 50-3268.

<div style="margin-left: 50%;">

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles D. Huston/
Charles D. Huston
Reg. No. 31,027
Attorney for Applicant

</div>

Customer No. 35617
Date: December 28, 2007